Soc Iol.
S.

CITY VALUES

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIAL STATUS AND POSSIBILITIES OF AMERICAN CITY LIFE

BY

C. LINN SEILER

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

CITY VALUES

AN ANALYSIS OF THE
SOCIAL STATUS AND POSSIBILITIES OF
AMERICAN CITY LIFE

BY

C. LINN SEILER

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS PRESENTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

I. THE VIEWPOINT

RAPID transition is the spirit of the present age. All about are evidences of the certain decay of dogma and convention—in science, religion, politics, and business. No longer does the old order please: no longer can the ancient superstitions hold the mind and heart. In contrast, we find a more thorough and intelligent inventory-taking of the social stock, a more rigorous and satisfactory disposal of an obsolete and worn-out civilization. The narrow emphasis on creed is giving way to a broader and more pragmatic concept of ethical life. In the business world there is an unrest that denotes a keener insight into industrial values and a better appreciation of large national issues. We feel stirrings of new life in those parts of the body social that we thought dead or sleeping. Fresh incentives revitalize old institutions. New associations form for new needs and works. The younger generation is playing an increasing part in this movement, not only in the furnishing of raw material for a more electric race, but also in the active impetus imparted to the older generation by its insistent demands for a more efficient and satisfying life. To an increasing degree are we becoming more intensely alive—physically, intellectually, and socially. And the tendency is in the direction of a collective appreciation of the sacrifices and pleasures of life—of those things that spell comfort, culture, and citizenship for the community as a whole.

The most interesting phase of this epoch is the undeniable and insatiable desire to "know things as they really exist." Sex psychology and sex hygiene are rapidly becoming common property as topics of serious conversation and thought. We are finding out why our cities are corrupt, and why vice, crime, and adulterated foods exist. The magazines and newspapers, quick to give the public what it wants, open their columns as forums of discussion on live contemporary topics. The keynote of this phase is *facts*—real facts—facts that have a meaning to each man, woman, and

child. Also, discussion and wide-spread knowledge are acting as wholesome checks to the mob-like public opinion so easily swayed by the quack politician or moralist. We are, for the first time, trying properly to appraise social and political values because we are beginning to see them in their true relations.

Another intensely interesting feature of the present state of the social mind is the emphasis placed on the concept of a *program.* We want a plan—an efficient, convenient, and quick method for obtaining results. There is a high premium put on the individual with a practical plan. Of course, one may find both the pessimist and the optimist in all the different grades of "programmists," and it depends largely on the object for which the program or plan is designed, as to where the protagonists and antagonists will turn for adherence. Though a program is unquestionably necessary (since it represents, as it were, the architect's drawings of the edifice to be built), a knowledge of the actual conditions for which the program is constructed is, however, more vitally important. To see values clearly, their relationship to each other and to the conditions that make them must be primarily and carefully portrayed. Unrelated collections of facts are chiefly ridiculous because no vital viewpoint can possibly be obtained nor any concept of justice or expediency visualized. Knowledge of conditions may be gleaned from different angles, depending on the point of view, but the truest angle of vision is that throwing the different parts of the problem into proportional relief, where each can be seen in contrast with the others. Thus, a program must, in the same way, fit every part of the problem it is designed to solve. It most possess unity and interrelation. Its potency depends on the harmony as well as the permanence of its structure.

Properly to visualize mass-evolution one must have an economic viewpoint—that is, a keen appreciation of the economic relations between human beings and the results of such relationships. To laud property rights is one thing; properly to value human rights is quite another. The former is a political attitude: the latter, a matter of economic morality. One tends to mold us into a narrow constitutional form: the other gives us the capacity for social enlargement that breaks down constitutional fetters. Physically speaking, the theory of property rights is *static,* as compared with

the *dynamic* one of human rights. Ethically considered, the former is *monistic* and *exclusive;* the latter, *pluralistic* and *mutual.* We have been accustomed to the property right theory for so long a time that we consider it impregnable, and, for practically all purposes, entirely satisfactory. The great trouble with the theory is its lack of permanence as a social program, since it presupposes an eternal faith in the sanctions of man-made law. Accepting this doctrine, political issues rather than human problems become the war cries. On the other hand, the economic viewpoint is a vital motive force, acting in a contagious way, permeating all classes and ages, breeding by discussion and knowledge, acquiring momentum as it lives. With it not only can mass-evolution be clearly seen, but the most intimate and important economic relations between us and our neighbors stand out in bold relief, showing new phases of the problem, exhibiting new needs and desires, giving us fresh material for our energies. We discover we have been quarreling over *methods* when we really lacked a definite *goal.* With our vision on a goal, new possibilities arise—of health, happiness, and efficiency. The *cost* of ways and methods becomes a less gloomy and troublesome feature of our discussions, while *values* interest us in increasing ratio. Human life then becomes vivid and valuable. Play becomes mutual, desires universal, efficiency collective. We gain because we mutualize ourselves and our interests. With this attitude we can exchange viewpoints—between capital and labor, between mistress and servant, between man and woman—because we have discarded political rights for human interests.

Of the many economic problems that engage our attention in the United States to-day, none has more possibilities of interest or is more vital and absorbing than the problem of *city life.* To some, the city is a political area administered by a particular governmental machine especially designed for regulating its affairs. To others, it represents an aggregation of individuals who are increasingly efficient, industrially speaking, because of certain advantages in location and co-operation. Still others look upon it as a huge, evil melting-pot into which everything social is thrown and from which are continually pouring the most intense poverty, the greatest vice, and the deepest degradation. Each

of these groups strives to amass data and evolve plans for rehabilitation, being actuated, in each case, by impulses and prejudices that result from their particular points of view. And though influential in their respective fields, though expert and enthusiastic, yet none are permanently effective because their actions are separated, their goals indefinite. The problem of city life is more than a local one. It is national in its effects on the morality of the country, and in its influence in determining the flux of human beings over the national area. The problem must, therefore, be approached in the same broad spirit. Our knowledge of current conditions must be catholic and exhaustive. Our program must stand the test of every phase of the subject at hand. Every city can glean from the experiences of every other in the way of novel methods or better standards. And though each may have particular local characteristics, yet all have common relationships that go to make up the problem of urban life.

Generally speaking, there are two sets of urban problems: those partially solved, and those as yet practically untouched. The former center themselves about our political viewpoint of citizenship: the latter are concerned with human rather than property values. In other words, those city activities showing the greatest relative efficiency are those illustrating the guarantee to property rights. Those enjoying the least popularity, and therefore having the smallest actual force, are the social and economic activities that are intended to improve the opportunities for sane human life, for health, and for pleasure. We thus have two sets of reformers: one, anxious to bolster up the political framework in order further to guarantee the political liberty of the voter; the other, with a viewpoint that stresses human life and rights, aiming at greater efficiency in some one department of government that will most quickly become a medium for its particular propaganda. It is not that either set is inherently wrong. We need increased efficiency in every city department. We also need purity in political activity. The real obstacle to the attainment of satisfactory results is the lack of proportion in our viewpoint, the overemphasizing of one particular phase, the enthusiasm anent a particular panacea, that detracts from the importance of the whole problem of urban life and that wastes our energies over a

fractional part of the entire adjustment. Obviously, complete readjustment is a matter of time. But this fact does not lessen the value of proportion and completeness in our plans. The vital question is: Shall we look upon city life, its activities, its opportunities, its benefits, and its defects, in a large and comprehensive way, or shall we try to make our adjustments singly, and at a time apparently best suited for a temporary repair? The logical answer is: No efficient readjustment of city life can be made effective and permanent until we consider the problem of city life as one of complex and yet integral evolution. Our apparently separate little problems are really interlaced and related. The study of one inevitably leads to the discussion of all. We must have a new attitude toward physical and social cause and effect. The rapid growth in the natural sciences has already proved the complexity of causes and results. In other words, the monistic viewpoint of life must change to a pluralistic one. The old method of isolating an individual from his environment in order to study him under our social microscope is ridiculous, because misleading and ineffectual. As we lose sight of the motivating forces that make him worthy of study, we fail properly to visualize him as he really is. And, just as all the activities of city life have some tangible connection with one another, and just as the obvious maladjustments in city life are consequences of a combination of causes, just so must any efficient plan of reform or readjustment be based on a comprehensive and human survey of the whole field in order scientifically to connect conditions with social results. We have to get a fresh line of vision in order to evolve a new line of action. Definite changes come easily and quickly when the need is keenly and universally felt. And needs are most keenly and permanently felt when they are not only universal, but human.

II. NATURE AND SCOPE OF CITY PROBLEMS

UP TO within a few years ago American city problems were considered to be the results of defective political machinery. For the first eighty years of our national life the average city was the plaything of the local politician. National problems were vital and engrossing, and little attention was given to the social consequences of dense aggregations of population or the frictions that result from fire hazards, tenement life, and the various changes in domestic régimes to which the urban dweller has to become accustomed. Migration from country to city had been relatively small, and the immigrant colonies in the latter had caused little uneasiness or inconvenience. Outside of one or two activities, such as police and fire protection,—and these directly connected with property rights,—governmental energy was expended along political and negative lines, the average middle- and upper-class citizen asking nothing better than to be able to carry on his business with adequate protection, and to enjoy his exclusive pleasures in his own social set. But we are now waking up to the realization of other needs and lines of action. The organized charity movement has given an impetus to a new viewpoint that has popularized many of the agencies hitherto deemed entirely within the province of the individual philanthropist and the church. Our reflective library philosopher is no longer the only "prophet crying in the wilderness." Isolated philanthropy is being replaced by co-operative social conservation. City problems are not increasing in numbers so fast as they are being newly discovered and better recognized. We are overhauling, for the first time, our stock of economic and social relationships. We are beginning to see that the important thing is not so much to make our business our life, but to make a business *of* our life.

City living becomes increasingly complex and difficult as population grows and congests. Home life has suffered severe modifica-

tion through the various economic and industrial changes that, in turn, make necessary new feelings and adaptations. New social pressures exist, not from lack of material resources, but because we have not as yet properly related our work and its results. Famine, plague, and other natural catastrophes, as obstacles to economic and social progress, have been eliminated. But their place has been taken by overwork, underpay, and malnutrition. These new pressures now bear most hardly on the margin of life, so to speak—on that part of the day that should be the *recreative* or *social* end. And increasing complexity of social relationships inevitably produces new frictions, which, though often temporary, are none the less real and potent at the time. For example, a rise or fall in the standard of living will necessarily test the difference in adaptability among the various social sets or groups. And these differences, to a great extent, measure the discomfort and misery of the new social frictions involved. Since we change our habits of life and viewpoints in matters of detail every year, we must expect the process of adaptation to follow, even though the process often brings unhappiness, if not actual discomfort and pain. Every new social need in the community creates a new part in our social mosaic that must be fitted in with nicety into the old framework.

If the new viewpoint be contrasted with the old, we are tending increasingly to emphasize that part of life that does not represent the working period. The city problems of to-day are not so much the problems of the workshop as those of the street and home; not the problems of cure, but of prevention; not of the regulation of existing conditions so much as the elimination of those conditions that definitely create city maladjustments. Their nature is social and ethical, rather than political or legal. To premise this concept, one must look upon his city as a definite area with distinctive and unique social pressures and outlets of energy, not merely as a given political boundary including a highly aggregated mass of impersonal human beings. A safe method of assay, in this connection, is to contrast urban with rural life in order to find those relationships and activities that are present in the former and absent in the latter. For instance, slum life, adulteration of food, water, and air, vice, and periodic unemployment are specifically

concerned with dense and dynamic social relationships, and present phases of adaptability to changes in city growth and habits. A sudden expansion in urban area or the introduction of a new industry will effect in a very short time a definite change in mode of life, hours of work, and methods of transportation. When new adaptations are forced upon even a fraction of a community, new problems arise. Crime and dirt do not arbitrarily gravitate to any particular district, except in the case of degree. Thus it must be recognized that what seem like separate problems overlap every other one. Each may have its separate province, since each results from some well-defined phase of our social environment. But all are measured in extent by the city limits itself. And in the end all need the same general kind of treatment, the same careful analysis, the same catholic and humane consideration.

III. CITY PROBLEMS—AN ANALYSIS

THE making of a satisfactory list of city problems for purposes of analysis is less difficult if a start is made from the basis of those unique urban frictions and reactions that are social in their nature. It is assumed that criticism will be directed toward some one point of the classification, since each of us has some particular viewpoint that naturally emphasizes one factor more than the others. But a starting-point must be fixed and a classification made, even though these are susceptible to detailed changes as the discussion proceeds.

In general, the vital city problems are as follows:

1. Aggregation of population.
2. Health.
3. Protection.
4. Transportation.
5. Living conditions.
6. Vice.
7. Crime.
8. Recreation.
9. Relief.
10. Industrial congestion.
11. Limit of social utility in size.

Each of these presents interesting aspects of densely packed human existence, and each assumes some unique urban pressures or frictions that act as obstacles to complete social happiness. All are related, and all affect the city as a whole.

(*a*) *Aggregation of Population*

Migration from country to city began with the Industrial Revolution. The rise of urban life in the United States is coincident with the introduction of factory methods and the obvious advantages of close proximity to markets. Especially noteworthy is the growth in city population from 1890 to 1912. Urban popula-

tion increased from about 36 per cent of the total population to over 46 per cent in this period. At the same time the rural districts suffered a decrease of from approximately 64 per cent to 54 per cent of the total population of the country.[1] While the total population has increased about 21 per cent in the decade from 1900 to 1910, the growth of cities was roughly 39 per cent. And while the New England section shows a rate of increase of only slightly over 21 per cent for city growth, there is a rise of 101 per cent in the Pacific division for city expansion. And this urban increase has not taken place only in the larger metropolis. In every State and territory there was a marked city expansion, and in seven States the rural population actually showed a decrease. Every State but two exhibited a more rapid urban growth than rural. Practically every city in this country feels the effect in varying degree.

Considering aggregation as a city problem, it is not to be assumed that all its effects are necessarily injurious. Larger opportunities for pleasure and education are among the most obvious advantages of city living. But that certain effects are wholesome to the majority does not vitiate the argument that dense aggregation is a cause of well-defined unfortunate social results. A strict standardization in mode of life and thought is forced upon the individual and family by the group. Individualism gives place to a weak and conventionally imitative morality. Neighborliness is practically absent from the city—a trait so characteristic of the rural community. In its place we find a hedonistic attitude of mind and a tendency to social demarcation that is best illustrated by club life and the various social "sets." Political issues are mixed and vague, because the spirit of strict, well-informed partizanship is lost. Thus an advantage is gained by the politician in the veiling of actual candidates for city offices as well as the real questions of vital moment to the voter, with the result that the latter is placed in the class of the uninformed and indifferent. The greater the mass of voters, the more possible it becomes to mix issues, to keep the single voter uninformed, to exploit one group at the expense of another. And this political exploitation has flourished

[1] See special preliminary Report of Bureau of Census on Urban and Rural Population in the United States, August 12, 1911.

best in our American cities, since here exist the unusual opportunities for the politician who seeks to take advantage of the difference in relationships due to large and dense aggregations. Our home life, too, is modified by a score of counteracting agencies. Dirt, noise, disease, and crime all tend to undermine the homogeneity of the home. Domestic arrangements must be radically changed to fit the difference in working hours and conditions, and marketing is done at long distance. Again, dense aggregation inevitably complicates the processes of communication. Congestion of traffic, limits of usable area, etc., are all factors. To sum up, all these point to a new series of social pressures that force the individual into a conventional mold, that bring an attitude of mind essentially different from that of the country dweller, and that create a very distinctive city morality that results in new needs, new reactions, new standards, and new actions. The greater the aggregation, the more crystallized does this city morality become. The personal human touch dies before the impersonality of the ever-changing crowd. Social control displaces individual control. Intensity of life, rather than harmony, becomes the order of the day. Artificial, man-made forces are emphasized in contrast to natural ones. Aggregation is not only a mere cause of this city morality: it is the basic reason for its very existence.

(*b*) *Health*

Complexity in social relations inevitably results in new pressures along the lines of physical health. No other separate city problem is of more importance, nor is there one that needs more careful treatment. On the other hand, none has received less keen and comprehensive attention in ratio to its importance. Municipal guardianship of health is still an idea in swaddling clothes—in the United States. The individual has to work out his own sanitary salvation in all but a few ways. Now the health problem never has been and never can be a problem for the individual. Its very nature gives a clue to the treatment that has been so grudgingly and inefficiently given in the past. It is assumed, in common and statute law, that the individual has the inalienable right and privilege of protecting himself. There has been no well-

developed public opinion on this matter until very recently; no concerted action on the part of those working along separate lines, for a really healthy community; no conception of the necessity for municipal guardianship of our physical, mental, and moral well-being.[1] Investigations and records attract but passing interest. There is no uniformity in city statistics, no co-operation between State and city, no universal and vital desire to eliminate the causes of ill health. Our viewpoint is static and narrow, primarily because we are uninformed. We instinctively shrink from small-pox contagion, but we do not see the many and terrible dangers of infection from smoky air, impure food, or dirt-laden ice and water. We individually demand quiet homes, but collectively we allow street noises that produce the neurasthenic man and woman. We condemn poor housing conditions, and at the same time permit the commercial landlord to erect and maintain open vaults and privies. Campaigns against the house-fly are now popular, but as yet we have taken practically no steps toward the permanent elimination of fly-breeding material. As a rule, when a definite movement for healthy conditions has been started, and when it has crystallized into some concrete undertaking on the part of the city,—such as the construction of a water-filter or an incineration plant for garbage,—public opinion allows the lobbying contractor and disreputable politician to make a mess of it. The city has not as yet adequately protected us against decayed food or the dirty handling of good food. It would be difficult to figure up the cost in life, ill-health, injury, and general debility from such causes. But the cost is there, and we are paying needlessly for it, every day and every year. In other words, we spend millions upon our hospitals and sanatoria—the pound of cure; we refuse to appropriate the same sum for the elimination of the causes of mortality and morbidity—the ounce of prevention. Records of births and deaths are carelessly kept. The lack of proper regulation of physicians and midwives, etc., is responsible for a large number of unrecorded deaths and births. Most investigations into housing conditions have been of a private nature.

[1] The January, 1912, issue of "The National Municipal Review" has an extremely illuminating article on this subject, entitled "Private Houses and Public Health," by John Ihlder.

And while no doubt thorough and accurate enough in their way, they have been undertaken only as one branch of a most comprehensive social work. As a result, the average reader of such reports considers it merely as a more or less interesting description of certain rather unpleasant conditions that do not affect him or her as a citizen. The usual municipal report on health is generally worthless, because influenced by certain political conditions—there is always a large element of "whitewash" about the information. Nor has the average city health bureau obtained either our confidence or support. Its great failure is its lack of system in telling facts, coupled with the arrant cowardice of the pay-roll official who does not want to do anything that demands a sacrifice of time, energy, or political advancement. Thus, in summing up the problem of city health it must be emphasized, first: we are dealing with a problem that has all the earmarks of a purely social set of frictions. Individual carelessness, wilfulness, and ignorance are seen to be comparatively negligible. The risks to the citizen in the matter of health are almost all offered by the city itself. The average human being is helpless against accident, infection, contagion, and neurasthenia. As long as we consider that the city health problem includes only general sanitation, we are only partially solving it. After all, there is no good reason why city life should not be healthy. The only apparent reason is that we have not yet demanded a permanently healthy city.

(*c*) *Transportation*

The problem of transportation is one that perhaps most aptly illustrates the interrelation of all city problems, while at the same time exhibiting aspects that indicate the contrast between the old and new viewpoint. We are only just beginning to see the relation between our transit system and the area of the city, the style and arrangement of houses, the distribution of population, and the establishment and prosperity of our suburbs. It is apparent that we are here concerned with a vast business enterprise: one of large and rapid profits; one needing but a low standard of managerial ability; and one that has been left for the past decades to be the "football" of the local politician and old-line business

man.[1] Our viewpoint has come about through the lack of social appreciation of a municipal business that has become an economic and social necessity. Distribution of population,—in order to eliminate living congestion,—a better type of city-dwelling architecture, efficient food distribution at lower cost, and the building up of suburbs are all practical results of adequate and constantly expanding transportation facilities. Rents then become possible of a desirable equalization, and recreation and education can be quickly universalized. The questions of franchise terms or methods of equipment are those of detailed ways of doing desirable things, not a matter of initial policy. City transportation will never be adequate when the relation between it and other social problems is not keenly and universally appreciated, and when the city has no consistent, as well as insistent, community concern in the management or regulation of this important function in municipal life. The transit system of any city is "the circulatory system" of the community. It corresponds to the veins and arteries of the human body. If adequate in capacity and elastic in its accommodations to the varying demands of the day, season, or generation, the community enjoys a comfortable and natural contact with its desires and opportunities. When transportation is slow, uncertain, clumsy, and exclusive, the citizen is deprived of the ability to carry on his business and life to the limit of their valuable and pleasurable possibilities. Tenements would cease to exist if transportation was provided that fitted both the needs and pocketbooks of tenement dwellers. Congestion dissolves naturally when transit systems are designed to give every city dweller the chance to live where he pleases. Vice, crime, ill health, and poverty diminish rapidly under conditions that allow freer movement of individuals, greater choice in the matter of home-building, and larger opportunities of enjoying recreation and comfortable surroundings. At present our city circulation is stagnant. And thus we suffer from social ailments that directly result from imperfect and dangerous transfusion of community blood.

[1] The discussion of Public Ownership and Operation of transportation facilities is out of place here, since not only is the idea still in the experimental stage in the United States, but also since, even under such a plan, our analysis of the real problem would be the same.

(*d*) *Limit of Social Utility in Size*

The average citizen—certainly the average business man—assumes that there is a virtue in mere size. The larger the city, the greater the industrial and social opportunities. This is apparently so axiomatic that to suggest a limit to the size of our urban communities is to invite instant credulity, if not actual antagonism. But let us glance for a moment at a few pertinent facts that may suggest a new line of reasoning upon city valuation. A review of the last census figures shows that the larger American cities have not increased in the same proportion with the smaller urban area.[1] It is the small city in the United States to-day that attracts our country brothers and sisters. The rapid advance of interurban electric service, the increase of rural free delivery, the popularity of the mail-order house, and the diffusion of popular literature—all are creating a feeling of independence in the smaller centers that did not exist thirty years ago. The city of 10,000 inhabitants has rapidly become self-sufficing, as well as socially valuable. The Associated Press has made possible the simultaneous publication of news that destroys in large measure the influence of the large metropolis. Popular advanced education, through the media of University Extension lectures, Chautauqua circuits, and state universities, has universalized knowledge of all kinds, and makes it unnecessary for one to leave one's own state, or even district, in order to acquire culture or to make use of business opportunities. The theatrical stock company and "one-night-stand routes" give even the smallest city the enjoyment of contemporary drama.[2] In a hundred ways the small city is gaining opportunities for prosperity and social happiness that were formerly monopolized by New York, Chicago, Boston, and Philadelphia. The metropolis is no longer the mecca, either industrially or socially. On the other hand, we can plainly find indications of "top-heaviness" in some of our larger centers: top-heaviness of both an industrial and population nature. It is a serious question, in many places, as to the best outlet for too densely packed a

[1] See Report of Bureau of Census on Urban and Rural Population in the United States, August 12, 1911.

[2] It is noteworthy that the recent rise of the municipal theater and the pageant has come about almost exclusively in the city of moderate size.

population. Apparently, the limit of physical resources in actual area has been reached. We have, therefore, taken to building up in the air, both in the way of office buildings and houses. In other cases industrial conditions evidence a decline in productivity due to congestion of plants and limits in engineering construction. We are reaching the limit of building height and weight.[1] A decreasing amount of necessary light and air is the natural result of sky-scrapers and closely packed industrial districts. Our best transit systems are taxed to the utmost to supply the normal demand for urban communication. Financial problems and political complications are increasingly common, due to the growth in complexity of governmental machinery that is made necessary for the carrying on of multifarious municipal duties. Domestic problems become more acute, and family maladjustments affect larger groups. Intense specialization of city functioning results in carrying the official farther from popular control. In short, there is a definite limit to city size—a limit set by economic and social convenience. When urban assimilation becomes a labored function, when we become obstacles to our own normal desires and needs, we reach the limit of social utility in size.

The other problems in our classification may all be analyzed in the same way. A study of one inevitably leads to a discussion of the rest. Ordinarily, we think of "protection" as having to do primarily with the obvious duties of the policeman—a question largely of the guarantee of property rights. But city protection should cover every phase of life where the citizen is individually helpless. Protection against accident in the home and on the street is only one side: the guarantee of honest measures and good food is another. The city presents risks in grade-crossings, inferior transit equipment, and fire hazards against which the individual is helpless. City protection is primarily a human problem. In like manner the problems of vice, crime, recreation, and relief, etc., all offer aspects unique to city environment. The roots of all go down far below the soil of our usual analysis and treatment.

[1] Several of the larger cities have already passed ordinances limiting the height of buildings.

We have hitherto only scratched the surface. Vice has ordinarily been considered a "woman" problem, and one that is assumed to be inherent to civilized life. On the contrary, it is a "man" problem—a problem of misuse of energy and leisure; a problem of lack of social opportunity for a clean life; *and a problem that is remedial*—if only we will get down to the real causes and make up our minds to eliminate them. Crime and recreation are two sides of the same shield. Relief represents the great waste of human energy, emotion, and money. It is the shining example of our lack of human conservation. We spend millions for the heterogeneous support of those derelicts that we create through our indifference, carelessness, or false morality. The study of each problem proves the same point—a point incident to all: we have not yet gone below the surface deep enough to discover the primary causes of our problems. We fail to visualize the human element and the importance of happy and efficient environment. Our heads are still in the vague and half-learned clouds of "heredity." We imagine that we will always have the poor with us, because they are, by some divine right, born to that estate. Our time has been taken up with business matters, such as franchises, profits, and scientific management, and we have convinced ourselves that it is practically waste of time for the actual solving of mere human problems. Palliatives, yes; but a permanent solution—it is too much trouble. We have lacked a community concern in the great ailments of urban existence. Our pound of cure has always been necessary, because we are too busy to apply seriously the ounce of prevention.

IV. CITY MALADJUSTMENTS

THE urban problems just discussed naturally give us material for thought regarding the maladjustments in city life. And it is in the keen and serious analysis of these maladjustments that we crystallize the new viewpoint toward city efficiency. Maladjustment is a very definite status of social and economic life that results in community costs, and that is due to remedial causes. The remedy for any maladjustment is, in all cases, co-operative, community action, or, in other words, social action. Maladjustment is merely a temporary status, the term of its existence dependent on the complexion of public opinion at any given time. Heredity, while not falling by the wayside, is receiving less attention—as a hypothesis of cause and effect—in proportion to environment. In environment we see conditions that we ourselves make to a large extent. It is a remediable and changeable status, so to speak, of social and economic life, the results of which we can measure with greater accuracy every year. To eliminate a maladjustment, therefore, means a new viewpoint toward environment, a more forceful public opinion as to its importance, and a new valuation of economic and social processes carefully tabulated.

A glance at the most obvious of the various city maladjustments will reveal certain specific and interesting aspects. First, a relation between them all in regard to the fundamental causes; second, social costs resulting from any one can be traced in any other. Each very definitely results in the waste of social energy, not only in the case of the individual, but as well of the family and the community at large. In order to visualize social costs, however, it is necessary to specify certain maladjustments that are emphatic.

They are as follows:

1. Congestion.
2. Disease.
3. Vice.
4. Break-up in home life.
5. Exclusion in recreation.
6. High rents.

It is to be emphasized, in the analysis of the above, that three tests shall always be applied. First: that maladjustments are the result of very definite economic and social causes; second: that social costs are inevitable; and third: that maladjustments are remediable by community co-operation. No economic analysis is effective with the old moral or political viewpoint. Human rights and values must at all times be stressed. Our maladjustments will never be eradicated until society turns from its present faith in machinery to the practical efficiency of keen, indefatigable, and universal social co-operation.

Taking up briefly the maladjustments referred to, let us apply the tests in order to prove their validity. First, as to causes being social and economic, rather than hereditary and natural. The causes of congestion and disease are now known intimately. He who runs may read, in volumes upon volumes of investigations and reports, the truthfulness of which is not discredited. In all cases it is seen that both maladjustments are direct results of certain conditions that we allow or create—conditions that exist because of the way we live or do business. Of late years the vice question has received greater attention from the hands of experts, and through the information gleaned by several conscientious commissions, we know the reasons for this particular phase of our social life.[1] Again, the first test is valid: the causes are either industrial or social. As to the break-up in home life, the average citizen is not on such sure ground. But a review of the usual conditions in our cities with regard to living accommodations and those agencies that counteract home influences gives a real clue to the fundamental causes. Night work, saloons, club life, noise, dirt, and continual sickness and poverty—all play their part. Exclusion in recreation can be traced directly to differences in social sets, lack of neighborliness, and lack of community interest in normal city functioning. High rents are the result of improper regulation of land holding and transfer, as well as of inadequate communication and distribution of food-products and goods. In all these maladjustments there can be seen the outcome of careless municipal guardianship and community indifference to social and economic waste. Too much time spent on reforming

[1] See Reports of Chicago and Minneapolis Vice Commissions.

the political machine and too little spent on renovating the physical and economic bases of city environment is responsible, at least for their continued existence.

The costs are also patent if our eyes are but open in the right directions. *Exploitation* is a term covering a multitude of social sins, among which we find a high mortality rate, decreased vitality, and a decided lowering of moral tone. Class distinctions are intensified, and unequal economic opportunity accentuated. The very rich and the very poor live side by side in the same physical environment, though in reality separated by a great social gulf. Stunted minds and bodies result from poor living conditions and disease. Our human derelicts are products of both disease and vice. While our juvenile delinquency and wasteful methods of relief hark back to the break-up in home life. The costs in our maladjustments are more than mere industrial costs; more than the lowering of manual and mental efficiency for work. They represent real obstacles to racial progress and urban development. City maladjustments of to-day are the conditions that represent the real sources of danger to American democracy.

We have for many years been striving to eliminate "political diseases." Some think we have utterly failed to effect any kind of a cure. Others aver that we are making rapid progress. Be that as it may, we have dismally failed to see the cancerous growth of a disease-breeding and inexcusable social environment that results in a ridiculous waste of human life and energy. The American business man refuses to allow industrial waste in his own plant, and eradicates the tendency toward it by adopting scientific methods of management and by utilizing the by-products of the industry. But society, especially in our cities, allows waste in unguarded machinery, maimed and diseased workers, and a poor quality of product. City maladjustments represent the adulteration of the human product that society is forced to accept. With maladjustments in existence, there can be no such thing as equal opportunity for all. "The City Beautiful" is a paradox, with congestion and disease still at hand. "The City Efficient" is only a dream, with high rents and vice. In short, city maladjustments are the diseases that must be diagnosed by the economist, in the same way that tuberculosis is diagnosed by the physician.

And the removal of causes making for social costs must follow the same line as in the elimination of yellow fever—by the destruction of the material that allows for breeding. "The City Efficient" has no maladjustments, economic and political. With a keen and wholesome community concern that guarantees efficient action when the facts are known, political maladjustments disappear into thin air: those of an economic and social nature gradually lose their force, and in a short time cease to exist as unwholesome features of city life.

V. CITY BUILDING

THE history of urban civilization has seen several epochs in which city values were computed in different terms. City environment has always been the direct result of the reactions springing from a particular epoch. The particular significance of the present one may be termed "the awakening of the city consciousness to the social and economic conditions that make city life one of social efficiency." Though we are still engaged in shortening the ballot and trying to tinker with our municipal machinery so that it will work more smoothly, yet a keener emphasis is beginning to be manifested in our attitude toward social environment, and a larger interest is being taken in the citizen as a "city dweller." We need, therefore, a brand new outlook upon city life for the creation of a comprehensive program for the permanent solution of city problems. In other words, we must "re-valuate" our city existence; we must decide what is necessary to our pleasure and welfare; and we must be ready to discard without qualms any and all conditions that produce pain and misery. And not only is it essential thoroughly to prick the public consciousness, but to goad it along normal, racial, and dynamic lines. A dynamic city heredity is a necessary asset. Progress must be built on the idea of future social insurance as well as temporary relief. Many of our constitutional traditions will have to undergo modification, if not absolute dissolution. A score of our habitual points of view and conventions will necessarily give way before a more social attitude.

"City building" means more than "the city beautiful" or "the clean city." It is a concept that allows for the widest latitude in opinions and methods. In the past methods have largely been tested from the standpoint of monetary costs. And monetary costs are naturally the most important when the political attitude toward the city is paramount. Discard the political element, and monetary costs become less emphatic. Social and economic

costs are matters of more vital interest, and the question of method gives way, as a slogan, to that of efficient and quick results. "City building" may thus be compared to a business-like computation of city possibilities for the most efficient type of city dweller, and for the ultimate standardization of a dynamic racial type.

Since our comprehensive program for city building is of interest to all of the different groups within urban limits, it would be well to divide the plan into several parts for purposes of social convenience in discussion. The following list, though not given in order of importance, will suffice to show the various aspects of city life that demand our immediate attention.

1. City dwelling.
2. City health.
3. City communication.
4. City recreation.
5. City industries.
6. City architecture.

To those who find this nomenclature novel, a word of explanation may be given here. City communication is definitely concerned with the physical basis of city life: its avenues of transfer and means of distribution—or, in other words, its streets, waterways, etc. City dwelling and city industries are concerned with "the city superstructure": the economic and social basis of shelter, home life, and labor. City health and city recreation have to do with the physical and mental uplift of racial standards: they produce a distinct city morality. City architecture is related to all the others, directly and vitally. The city architect is more than a designer of houses and factories. His work covers landscape gardening, improvement of waste places, the renovation of the worn-out, and the conserving of all sorts and kinds of city material. He is as much interested in streets and river banks as in gardens and libraries. And so we find our various parts are not disjointed fragments, but rather contiguous and overlapping pieces of a finely conceived mosaic of social and economic progress.

What, then, shall be our policy for the new city—"the city efficient"? Primarily, we want and must have adequate and comfortable living accommodations for every family and every

human being within the limits of the city. And to this end we should have, first: A very definite and permanent supervision and regulation of municipal housing conditions. There must be a community guarantee of a single and wholesome standard of home life, along the normal lines of health, security, quiet, and convenience. Secondly: There must be a systematized segregation from industrial life and its attacks upon the home. Thirdly: Permanence, durability, and adaptation in the city dwelling must be essential factors in its construction. Fourth: The city dwelling must guarantee the privacy, the sanctity, and the permanence of family life. It must be standardized to meet family conditions—not individual conditions. Thus city dwelling is not only a matter of concern to the city architect, but also to the city administrator and city business man. Socially guaranteed dwelling arrangements mean greater convenience, better health, a higher type of home life, and equal opportunity for all groups along the lines of racial progress. City building is impossible until our city superstructure is well planned, adequately constructed with a view to permanent social investment, and socially regulated in the interest of all.

To build a healthy city should be considered as practical an aim of any municipal administration as to build "a city beautiful." No city that is full of diseased bodies and minds, of men and women ugly through infection, suffering, or overwork, is really "a city beautiful." Nor is a city with a high mortality rate resulting from preventable, contagious, and infectious diseases, and from accidents, etc., good material for "a city efficient." The present type of city plan is merely "whitewashing" the old city when it does not call for the elimination of preventable disease. Our program must be revitalized by an increased value placed on human life in the mass. There must be an equal valuation of the life of the child in the slums and the child in the avenue mansion. We must recognize that contagion is as dangerous to the rich man's family as to the family of the low-income wage worker. The only difference is that the former has the benefit of high-priced care and diagnosis, and thus escapes the mortality column. City health should not be a matter of groupal opportunity. It is a matter of universal concern. And so our program for the build-

ing of a city along the lines of community health would be something as follows:

First: Health must be a recognized and capitalized asset in the life of every human being, the absence of which lowers the industrial and social efficiency of the community. The death of industrial workers, either through preventable diseases or accidents, must be considered a public disaster for which the public is directly responsible. There is as much reason, sentimentally speaking, for lowering the flag at half-mast because a broken filter means the death of a thousand people in one's city in one week, as when an ocean liner goes down with an equal number of souls.

Second: City health should be guaranteed in order to insure the old-age worker. We spend millions every year on pensions to old soldiers, on the assumption that the pensioner is incapable of doing the work of the average able-bodied industrial citizen. Transfer the same money to the creating and maintaining of conditions that prevent premature old age, and a large part of our problem is solved. With the old-age worker as a part of the social mosaic, we make a definite advance in industrial processes, we have gotten a new ideal in work as well as a new quality of ambition. We not only lengthen the life of the worker, and, therefore, increase the aggregate of industrial energy, but we also add to the social fund of efficiency and happiness, and gain in racial facilities, In short, we gain in labor efficiency and lose in relief waste.

Third: City health should be looked upon as a greater guarantee to the health of the luxurious (or high-income) class than our present haphazard system. Disease is the most intangible, insidious aspect of city life we have to deal with. It is only by forcing each and every one in the community to realize that one single case of scarlet fever commonly means a hundred cases before it can be stamped out, and that the rich and poor alike are susceptible to such a disease, that we can prepare the ground for a normal point of view. To get at this phase of the question most expeditiously it is necessary to insist on an immediate and relentless campaign against every form of disease-breeding material within city limits.

And, lastly, our program for city health must be related to the problem of race eugenics. It is impossible to create a perfect

moral and physical type of human being from a race that is disease-racked. We cannot change human nature, but we can do away with the conditions that make for imbeciles, premature indigents, and criminals. We try to enforce laws against expectorating on the pavements because we fear the danger of tuberculosis. Yet we allow that which breeds hundreds of tubercular individuals in a day in all our American cities. In the same way we create and allow conditions that make for vice, and then shudder at the enormous prevalence of venereal disease. And yet enough has been shown, in the discussion of vice, to prove the existence of a weak and useless coming generation that springs from a present generation with such a high percentage of those venereally infected. City building, therefore, must guarantee city health. Dirty streets, poor dwellings, vicious resorts, and over-worked citizens must go. With these miserable appendages Progress limps on her way, and Democracy becomes merely a political shiboleth. Civilization demands steady progress in order to be noteworthy, and progress is always slow when vitality is low. City health means perfect vitality, community progress, and the existence of a virile democratic standard of life.

City Communication

City communication includes more than mechanical transportation. Avenues of communication within the city should comprise all streets, all forms of transportation, and all waterways that have to do with the possible and convenient circulation of the inhabitants throughout its separate districts. To plan a transportation system without reference to the progressive plotting of new districts is to lose sight of the new concept of city communication in the light of true city building. Therefore, in crystallizing a program that shall be specifically devoted to convenient human and commodity circulation within urban limits, a very much larger scope and a more dynamic reach must be premised than is at present done. Adequate city communication, for instance, is not possible when individual property rights can act as an effective bar to a real solution, nor can dynamic progress in any direction be made on the old political basis, where the sacredness of property

rights and the violation of human rights are sanctified to the extent that they are at present. Our generalizations for a new program must contain the germs of the new economic and social viewpoint. They must be built on a social concept of city values—not on commercial, legal, or political ones.

First: In connoting a wider sphere of usefulness and activity for city communication, city administrators and experts must lay out a program along lines of social and moral evolution. Every possible avenue of human circulation and material distribution is to be used dynamically and thoroughly, and in the light of socially scientific methods.

Second: City communication should be the most adaptable feature of city life. By this is meant adaptation to the constant changes in the growth of population and the distribution of inhabitants in the various localities corresponding to the expansion of the city area. One of the most notable aspects of urban transportation in the United States is its reluctance to adapt itself easily and quickly to the social demands of the community. Profits have always been considered first. Possible improvements come only when the stockholder is satisfied. Both extension and improvement of service, to meet the constantly growing social demands of the community for efficient communication, is not only possible, *but socially imperative*. No city dweller should be forced to depend upon the motor car, the taxicab, or other private and incidental means of conveyance. There should be the same increase in the standards of efficiency in transportation that there is in business. Dynamic progress through the agency of public utilities is not possible when financial profits and social interests are mixed. The stockholder and the citizen have never yet been able to agree. It, therefore, would seem, assuming that the transportation system has the largest element of public interest of any of our municipal monopolies, that urban society must demand a variety of city communication that is controlled in the interest of the community—and not for profits.

Third: City communication, as a program, is only haphazard and, therefore, ineffective, unless considered in relation to the entire program for city building. Transportation in the typical American city has been largely instrumental in determining not

only the location of our dwellings, but also their size and construction. There is also a distinct connection between efficiently planned transportation and clean streets, congestion of traffic, disease, and crime. The price of land, as well as rents,—and inventions looking to changes in living conditions,—are also modified by certain phases of the transportation problem. These factors must be considered in any practical discussion. Communication is a complex problem where costs and effects are of a pluralistic rather than of a monistic nature. Improvement and extension of service must be standardized along human lines. The matter of revenue is incidental. In other words, convenient, safe, and adequate communication is to be as much assumed as pure milk, good water, or fresh air.

City Recreation

A deficit in recreation is to the community what the lack of proper food is to the individual. The well-to-do city dweller has no end of opportunities for normal recreation—all of which is gotten by the waving of the dollar bill. In contrast, the low-income family is socially incapable of providing itself with means of recreation; or, what it does get is, in most cases, adulterated and in small quantities. To plan a new city, to build a beautiful, efficient community, we must provide the necessary quantity of social foods in the proper dietary proportions for perfect social assimilation. Too much education and too little recreation are as socially bad as too large a quantity of meat in proportion to other food-stuffs. City building lacks one of its most essential bases when it fails to take into account the physical, mental, and moral importance of "re-creation"—for that is what recreation means. The so-called evil—or anti-social—recreations, such as hard drinking, disorderly street conduct, vice, gambling, etc., are all definite examples of energies deflected into wrong anti-social directions, because proper channels for the outlet of these same energies were not provided by us as a community. It is comparatively easy to supply recreation for the child, since the child is, to a greater extent, convenient clay for social molding, and with greater potentiality in the matter of healthy reaction. Moreover, child recreation is not supposed to be based on the furnishing of a social

contrast to work. The adult needs recreation in proportion to the fatigue of the individual, due to long hours, unhealthy dwelling environment, and the amount of education received. Not only the reactions of health, but also the psychological reactions, must be taken into account. Social solidarity, the vitalizing of a healthy public opinion, the breaking-down of class distinctions and the various racial feuds so common in this country are all very definite and inevitable results to be gained through universal adult recreation. To be planned for in its highest and best form, it must regard the reactions of the adult as of equal importance to that of the child. It is a poor civilization that saves the child at the expense of the parent; that wrecks the adult community to acquire a more normal juvenile population. Racial progress is premised on the health of the present generation, not the possible improvement of the future.

And so our program for practical recreational facilities may be summarized thus:

First: The problem of recreation must be studied primarily from the physiological standpoint of the necessity of the outlet of human energy, in order to maintain an effective social metabolism. Opportunity for play is not to be based on an esthetic value of mere psychological momentary enjoyment. Recuperation of energy—physical, mental, and moral—must take place along recreative and conservative lines. Working energy must be built up through the expenditure of certain different kinds of human energy, or the conserving of other kinds. The blood must be sent away from the brain; new muscles are to be used; deadened nerves revitalized.

Second: No distinctions must be made on account of income. It must be as certain, as it is possible, that recreation shall be enjoyed by every city dweller, irrespective of his salary (or wage), and his position in industry. This does not mean that we are to provide motor cars for all, nor that compulsory attendance at concerts and the theater be premised. It is not necessary to make recreation compulsory: the mere existence of equal and unlimited opportunities for it will result in an universal acceptance of its advantages. The point to be emphasized is—the poor man shall have as much right to use his leisure in ways that are healthy,

pleasurable, and educative as the rich man; and to this end we must have lower-priced drama, opera, and other forms of artistic amusement. Parks, playgrounds, gymnasia, and other facilities for manual reactions must be at the command of all—for the same reason that pure water is insisted upon. We must make it as easy for the Italian family in the tenement colony to hear Caruso sing, to play tennis or golf, to study and enjoy sculpture and painting, etc., as for the millionaire on Fifth Avenue.

Third: It is impossible to expect that recreation will be a means of mass enjoyment and participation unless its forms are adapted to the social and economic needs of the particular community. It is only in the realization of the fact that enjoyment must be universally appreciated that certain forms can be made practically and immediately effective. Recreation is to be looked upon, not only as a means for the improving of the health of the individual, and for providing outlays of energy along lines of pure and social enjoyment, but also as a means for very definitely creating and making permanent the social solidarity of the community. The exclusive clubs and limited playgrounds are alike anti-social. Even our public school of to-day feels the devil's touch of discrimination on account of some racial or income prejudice. Recreation, to be permanently effective, must be democratic. Participation in it should be convenient, optional, and socially desired.

And, lastly, the methods—the particular forms which the opportunities may take—should never be rigid. We have seen what rigidity in policy and methods mean in political and business life. To-day the school system in this country is under strong indictment as a failure. The reason for public sentiment is the assumption that rigidity in methods is unwise, undemocratic, and impractical—because it does not give the required results. Recreation should be adapted, not only to the changing mode of life through various generations, but also to the difference in social and economic conditions for any given period or year. No citizen ought to be forced to employ his leisure in any way set by either a few, or even the minority, in the community. The right way is to provide facilities, mechanical or otherwise, for the enjoyment of new forms of recreation whenever the latter manifest themselves.

City recreation must, therefore, base its program on a greater importance of leisure. Leisure should be as definite a human asset as health. In fact, health and leisure are two parts of the same subject—from the standpoint of racial evolution. Civilization is tested, from one standpoint, according to the length of period allowed the child for play and physical growth before we set him to work. A civilization that eliminates leisure from any portion of its adult opportunities is on a par with that putting its children to work before the period of childhood has been passed. Well-employed leisure is as industrially and socially important as well-employed labor. To-day we are beginning to realize the benefits of organized labor. *Organized leisure is nothing more or less than socialized recreation.* Individual or class recreation is as much anti-social as gambling or vice. Recreation, to be human, to be effective, to be a real part of the building of our new city, must be organized and socialized along dynamic lines of community and racial evolution.

City Industries

An equally definite and human stand must be taken in regard to our attitude toward city industries. There is hardly a business within the municipality to-day that does not vitally affect the lives and happiness of the citizens within the community. We have argued that the transportation service shall be socially controlled. In the same way, water, gas, electric light, milk, and food distribution, ice manufacture, and slaughtering are activities that are social in their nature. The very existence of necessary inspection in order to guarantee health or promote greater convenience is in itself an admission of the social nature of the enterprise. The point is: how far shall we go in the listing of industries that shall be socially controlled, and what ought to be the policy with regard to the co-ordinating of private and public interests?

First: Going on the assumption that all city industries influence city building along social and economic lines, our program for our new city must not only recognize the existence of these industries as factors in community life, but must refuse to allow private and social interests to conflict at any point. As soon as these two interests conflict, the new city builder has obtained prima facie evidence

of the existence of a social defect, for which the remedy is socialization of the particular enterprise. As long as there is no public protest, even from a minority, against the status or management of any enterprise within city limits, we may safely conclude that it falls into the category of private concerns that are not ready for community control. If the city is concerned in the inspection of a particular industry, it is equally concerned with the location of plants, the management of the business, and the distribution of its products.

Second: It is necessary to consider the community value, not only of the products of an industry, but also of its management, prior to the matter of financial dividends. Location of factories, of business houses, and in fact of all industrial plants, should be as definitely a part of our dynamic city plan as in the case of dwellings. There is no logical reason why the business man should be given prior right to the opportunities of city environment over the average city dweller. If our cities are to be considered as merely industrial centers in the narrow sense, we had better remold our whole civilization. City life is primarily a life of human beings, not the life of machinery and stock dividends. The city dweller should have, collectively, the first and last word in the re-creation of his own environment—not the stockholder and corporation president.

Third: City industries should be placed under the burden of proof of their own social efficiency. Poor business management, resulting in inferior product and inadequate distribution, should be socially penalized by forfeiture of existence or municipalization. There should be no such thing as the exploitation of the city dweller by any city industry, either in the matters of quality of product, convenience of purchase and carriage, or price.

Fourth: The accepted fact that a commodity has become a social necessity should automatically result in immediate municipalization. A social necessity is not naturally, and never should be, a source of private exploitation. It ought to be an unheard-of thing to declare a dividend on the stock of an enterprise that has become so large and important a part of the life of that particular community that its absence would be a serious obstacle to the maintaining of the normal standard of living. We

might as well recognize our present lack of humanitarianism in our concept of the regulation of city industries. Our political viewpoint, resulting in the sanctity of private property rights, results in the haphazard location of industries and acts as a menace to a normal city environment. To build our city properly, *the business man must exist for the community, not the community for the business man.*

City Architecture

The control of the physical environment of the city in advance of actual building is a policy that the American cities, almost without exception, never had.[1] As a result, city growth has been inharmonious and uncomfortable. Our communities have been exploited for the advantage of the onrushing herd of business interests who demanded every inch of room that was possible for quick dividends, at the expense of beauty, health, and convenience. In Germany the city is a very permanent institution. In the United States we are apparently so afraid that it will disappear before our very eyes at any moment that there is hardly any use in taking pains over its beautification or growth. The German ideal is to have his city an artistic creation from every standpoint —industrially, from the standpoint of form and color, as a place to live in, and in the matter of normal growth. The American, at his best, is just as artistic as any other race; the chief obstacle to his being his best at all times is his reluctance to submerge his private and business self in his artistic and social self, even when his own city is concerned.

First: A city should be planned for centuries—not for years. The measure of social value in city architecture should always be the social utility of the particular thing desired. Social utility is a constant test, a measure of social value that fits any epoch and any environment. There is every reason why we should plan for the distant future, looking at the city as a permanent place of abode, as a place subject to unlimited change and growth, as a physical entity that will live through many evolutions in political structure and moral standards. The best reason that can be

[1] Washington, D. C., is the only exception among the large cities. It was laid out very definitely more than a hundred years ago to accommodate a million people.

found for building merely on the needs of the present decade is that it involves only a small expenditure of money. This, to the average business mind, is a decided virtue. But, on the contrary, the permanent planning for the unlimited future not only does not require any more initial outlay, but it also means the saving of an immense amount of money which is now wasted in temporary structure or repairs. The argument becomes more impressive if the analogy of the householder, planning a residence for a growing family, is used.

Second: City architecture must concern itself, not only with the physical environment of the city, but also the artificial conditions of life. The residence district must be protected from industrial friction. The home should be guaranteed privacy, quiet, and permanence. It is perfectly possible to so locate and distribute our industries within city limits that congestion of plants can be eliminated. It is also possible for business to work under "one-story" conditions, thus insuring more light, better air, and safer and more comfortable labor conditions. The answer usually made to this suggestion, "It can't be done," is merely the old, old one of, "It is being done, and done successfully."

Third: The social regulation of city communication is part of the work of the new city architect. It is useless to provide good homes and well-located plants, without at the same time affording efficient communication. Every avenue of transit and transfer should be quickly and permanently utilized. Communication should act as the great influencing factor in the location of population and the distribution of products. It should be the servant of the community, not the business of a few people.

Fourth: Our new type of city architecture will emphasize the importance of leisure as an asset. The American city, except in a few cases, does not allow for normal street life. There is little inducement to making use of our parks, since the avenues of approach are dirty, narrow, or ugly, or because they are so situated that our inadequate transit facilities make them inaccessible except to a very limited minority. As a natural result, we live in our homes, where our leisure takes exclusive and class lines. Our amusements and pleasures become questions of limited group interests. American home life makes it possible to "shut out

the rabble," to be aristocratic in our leisure, to make easy the establishment of a "Blue Book" and a "Four Hundred." Until we take the stand that our city streets and parks shall create definite and equal opportunities for leisure, our plan for a new city of comfort, pleasure, and happiness is by so much ineffective. Poor city architecture and temporary planning give us only the type of citizen that we have at present: a citizen that feels keenly the many needless frictions of city life, and who reacts under them in ways that are detrimental to the community as well as to himself. Our social defects are to a large extent of an institutional nature, and one of the greatest in American life of to-day is the lack of proper relation between the human community and its physical environment. Efficient city architecture will thus have to be based on the readjustment of relationships, and the elimination of social frictions that come from architectural defects.

VI. THE NEW CITY IDEAL AND VIEWPOINT

IT IS now possible, perhaps, to visualize clearly the new viewpoint toward urban activity and city environment. To transfer the emphasis from one place to another shifts the center of gravity, so to speak, and modifies direction and velocity. The present American city of to-day is unequally ballasted. The center of gravity is misplaced, and progress is uneven and slow. The crew are engaged in endless discussion and strife over the size of the anchor or the particular number of strands in the new main-sheet; and the passengers run about helplessly in the confusion, endeavoring to help the crew, getting in each other's way, and often being knocked down in the factional scuffles. Orders come from everywhere, and every one disclaims responsibility for obedience. Meanwhile the boat plows sluggishly through the calm sea, rocking from side to side and leaving a tremendous wake behind that looks like the proverbial "cow-path." No one stops to think of scientifically looking for the difficulty, of going below the water-line to find the trouble. The rigging is supposed to be the key to good or bad results: if only the proper arrangement of ropes can be effected, the ship will leap ahead on a straight and even keel.

The American citizen is definitely a product of his own environment as well as his own racial heredity. He is descended from pioneer ancestors, some of Puritan or Friendly stock, some of Dutch or Huguenot—but all of whom had to work and fight for the comforts and means of life. Their business was to make existence possible for themselves and their families. Their standard of living was a God-fearing, Indian-killing, brute standard. But three centuries of material progress, of discovery, of invention and improvement, have changed the forces that used to act as pressures. Labor-saving machinery and greater efficiency, on the one hand, and the security of national isolation, on the other, have ameliorated the intensity of the bread-winning struggle.

We no longer have to fight in order to live. But traditions and habits are strong. Actions still take place automatically—the result of a mold of mind that is generations old. We no longer have to work the way we did—*but we think we have.* We look at our material work through a microscope, and it looms up, tremendous and all-important. It is the old Genie of the Bottle—all-pervading and tyrannical. In contrast, we gaze at our few pleasures through the telescope. The effect is to throw the objects looked at out of all proportion to their normal relations with the surroundings. We try to get a bird's-eye view of recreative life, for we are reluctant to spare too much time from our work. The American prides himself on long office hours, no idle class or aristocracy, and his ability to see a foreign country in a week.

On the other hand, we exhibit an extreme reluctance to the acceptance of anything that savors of paternalism or bureaucracy. We orate and write about "strong republican government," and then make it as difficult as possible for any kind of governmental machinery to work to the limit of its social efficiency by refusing to supply the necessary social co-operation. A philosopher once remarked: "The anarchist is the man who does not want government for any one; the socialist is the man who wants government for every one; the individualist is the man who wants government for every one—but himself." The American business man is still intensely individualistic. Our laws on private property illustrate this trait to a nicety. Business is an individual matter, not to be touched by "sovereign" government, though business is loud in its appeals for help from this same government when it is "up against" any problem that it cannot solve itself. Recognition of the labor union and the recall of judges are equally damned, because the business man sees in these two "theories" the subversion of his time-honored right to special privilege—or, in other words, the right to run his own concern in his own individual way, regardless of social costs. Is it any wonder that the "masses" are beginning to stir—to feel the pain of constant, long-endured pressures that are the result of man-made, environmental frictions? Is it surprising, that with the two viewpoints, there is a political and social schism that causes discontent, crime, rebellion, and the breakdown in religious and ethical standards?

The individual viewpoint is essentially political. Moreover, it is selfish and therefore anti-social. It thus becomes ineffective for large aggregations—in short, for city life. The results show a warped and stunted social and economic development, as well as a progress that is absurdly slow. We try to excuse ourselves with the argument, "We can't change conditions too quickly, it might be bad for business." Or, "It must be a gradual process of evolution"; or, again, "Yes, I know they are doing it successfully in Europe, but it won't work here. The American public will not stand for such a radical change." These are the familiar salves to our political and individualistic consciences. In the mean time we are suffering losses—social, moral, and monetary—that retard progress and make life inconvenient and incomplete. We are top-heavy with business. We have loaded the decks with structural iron, stocks, and sweatshops. It is not evenly distributed, nor securely battened down. Victor Hugo, in one of his most impressive novels, describes with horrible vividness the experience of a loose cannon, rolling about the deck of a storm-tossed vessel, strewing the dead in its richotting path, and all but completely wrecking the ship. To-day, our American cities allow the irresponsible and unregulated conduct of their business concerns to result in losses that all in the community must pay. When the losses are too keenly felt, a shift is attempted to a new kind of government, or a new method of keeping books is tried, or a new set of officials is promptly elected to prevent future calamities. But we do not look below the water-line. The primary causes remain undiscovered, and the reform is entirely superficial.

What we need is a brand-new way of looking at city life before we attempt to renovate what we have now. To build an elevated line when the subway has been invented is a static and superficial attempt at progress. To spend years in the construction of a bridge that is inadequate for the increased traffic when completed is a waste of good engineering skill and economic foresight—to say nothing of money. To consider only the present generation's needs is to invite corruption and lack of responsibility. "Quick investment" is always at a premium under such conditions. There is no longer any fear of the sudden end of the world. This

point was settled about eighteen hundred years ago. Why not provide, then, for the next century as well as this? The basic reason for our political corruption—especially in the cities—is this "grab-quick" attitude of mind that we all possess. Until we make our standards of work, life, and progress dynamic ones, until we value human existence in terms of racial progress instead of industrial units, until our concept of life is pluralistic—city development will be slow, costly, unhappy, and inefficient. A new balance sheet must be struck off with some new economic items substituted for the old monetary ones. New values must be created by new demands. Leisure, health, convenience, security, and a higher type of morality must be predicated as definite and necessary city assets. City advertising in the future will tell of the then obviously accepted advantages of education, amusement, health, and convenience—instead of proclaiming the now highly thought of superiority in location for sweatshops, banks, textile mills, and slaughter-houses. It should be a universally accepted axiom of city life that public and private interests shall never come into conflict. And they never will when community concern is as common and broad as citizenship. In fact, real citizenship must mean a direct part in the social control of public activities in city life. Expansion, change, or innovation ought never to be guided by individuals, or for individual interests. Efficient urban life will come to mean the daily enjoyment of every privilege and guarantee to human comfort and security that is possible in any given epoch. This will mean literally a dynamic existence, where there is constant change in ideals and reactions, and therefore a corresponding change in ways of supplying the demands set up by the ideals. Individualism will still be a part of life. But it will be socially controlled, and as such will represent the great motive force in the single man or small group that leads the way through the centuries as the inevitable pioneer in the arts or sciences.

And so our new city will be built along brand-new lines: lines of beauty, comfort, and convenience. It will then seem ridiculous to us, this present city plan of ours. We will wonder how we got along at all. But the rebuilding is possible only where community interest is potential, vivid, and constant; where social rights are

emphasized; where private privilege extends only to the point where others may suffer; and where primary, pluralistic causes are discovered for our maladjustments, and where our programs are based on racial rather than particular needs and desires.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.*
May 25, 1912

Pamph Seiler, C.Linn
Sociol City values.
S

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED